

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed December 11, 2008, claims 1 – 8 were rejected. Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the below-provided remarks. No claims have been amended, added, or canceled.

For reference, the title has been amended as suggested in the Office action.

### Objections to Drawings

The current application is a U.S. National Stage application. The drawing requirements for U.S. National Stage applications are identified in MPEP 1825 and labeling of figures as "Prior Art" is not required (see PCT Rule 11.11). Further, MPEP 1893.03(f) states that "[t]he USPTO may not impose requirements beyond those imposed by the Patent Cooperation Treaty (e.g., PCT Rule 11)." In view of the above, Applicants respectfully assert that labeling Figure 1 as "Prior Art" is not required in the current application.

### Response to Claim Rejections

Claims 1 – 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Main et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,497,123, hereinafter Main). Additionally, claims 7 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Main in view of Saski (U.S. Pat. No. 5,578,943). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Main in view of Seevinck et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,682,098) and claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Main in view of Seevinck and further in view of Hughes (U.S. Pat. No. 4,973,857). However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over the cited references for the reasons provided below.

#### Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

"A transconductance circuit intended to convert a differential input voltage, supplied as two signals on two inputs, into a differential output current, characterized in that, where each of the two signals of said differential input voltage is supplied to each input through *a follower transistor* connected to said input by its emitter and *receives said signal on a control electrode*, each of the two inputs of the transconductance is connected to *a respective current source* that is differentially controlled by the other input of the transconductance, said

current source being such that the current supplied to each input by said current source eliminates current variations caused by voltage variations of the input voltage signal.” (emphasis added)

Main does not disclose follower transistors as recited in claim 1

Claim 1 recites in part “a follower transistor...receives said signal on a control electrode” where “said signal” is the input signal. The Office action cites transistors 49 and 56 of Main as disclosing the follower transistors of claim 1. However, Applicants assert that neither transistor 49 nor transistor 56 “receives said signal on a control electrode” where “said signal” is the input signal as recited in claim 1.

Additionally, with reference to claim 2, the Office action again cites transistors 49 and 56 as disclosing the first transistors (e.g., T1+ and T1-). However, Applicants assert that transistors 49 and 56 of Main do not disclose both the follower transistors, TF+ and TF-, and the first and second transistors, T1+ and T1-, as recited in claim 2.

Because Main does not disclose follower transistors as recited in claim 1, Applicants assert that claim 1 is not anticipated by Main.

Main does not disclose current sources as cited in claim 1

Claim 1 recites in part that each input has a respective “current source that is dynamically controlled by the other input of the transconductance, said current source being such that the current supplied to each input by said current source eliminates current variations caused by voltage variations of the input voltage signal.” Applicants have found no such reference to a current source in Main. Additionally, the Office action does not address the “current source” limitation of claim 1. Because Main does not disclose current sources as recited in claim 1, Applicants asserts that claim 1 is not anticipated by Main.

Dependent Claims 2 – 8

Claims 2 – 8 depend from claim 1. Applicants assert that these claims are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Mark A. Wilson  
Reg. No. 43,994

Date: March 11, 2008

Wilson & Ham  
PMB: 348  
2530 Berryessa Road  
San Jose, CA 95132  
Phone: (925) 249-1300  
Fax: (925) 249-0111